

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned office action, all of the pending claims, claims 1-20, were rejected under Section 102(b) over Bridges.

Responsive to the rejection of the claims, independent claims 1 and 15 have been amended, in manners set forth herein, believed to distinguish better the invention of the present application over Bridges. Amendments made to various of the dependent claims are made responsive to amendments made to their parent claims or to correct for informalities. New claims 21-40, including independent claims 21, 25, 29, and 35 are further set forth herein.

With respect to exemplary claim 1, the claim has been amended, now to recite that the network-portion capabilities contained in the listing are updateable responsive to access attempts by the mobile node to access the network portions. Amended claim 15 contains analogous recitations. Support for the claim amendments are found with respect to the descriptions of Figures 4, 5, and 6. With respect to Figure 4, steps 112, 114, and 116 are described on page 12, lines 21-27. With respect to Figure 5, column 122 of the listing is described on page 12, line 31 and page 13, line 2. And, with respect to Figure 6, steps 146, 148, and 152 are described on page 13, lines 22-25.

Review of Bridges indicates that a memory 67 that stores a preferred system identification list (PSL) and/or an intelligent roaming data base (IRDB). This further indicates in Table 2 classes of service. And, Bridges further describes over-the-air programming (OAP).

However, Bridges fails to disclose updateability of a listing in a manner recited now in claims 1 and 15. Specifically, there is no disclosure in Bridges, nor can any inference be drawn therefrom, of updating of listing responsive to access attempts made by a mobile node.

Bridges also fails to disclose a possibility of network-portion selection made in a manner recited in claim 1, as now amended. Bridges fails to provide a mechanism by which to permit selection of a network portion that is not identified in its memory 67. Claim 15 is analogously amended. And, analogously, Bridges fails to disclose the operation of selectively selecting an other network portion recited as now amended.

The applicant further asserts that the newly-proposed independent claims are also distinguishable over Bridges. For example, with respect to claim 21, Bridges fails to disclose

updating of a preferred roaming list based on a comparison of a roaming list together with currently available networks. Claim 25 includes analogous recitations and is analogously believed to be distinguishable over Bridges. With respect to claim 29, Bridges fails to disclose an operation of selecting a currently available network if no match is found on a preferred roaming list. Claim 35 includes analogous recitations and is believed to be distinguishable over Bridges for this same reason.

The dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective parent claims. And, the dependent claims are believed therefore to be distinguishable over Bridges for the same reasons as those given with respect to their parent claims.

In light of the foregoing, amended independent claims 1 and 15, newly-proposed claims 21, 25, 29, and 35, along with the dependent claims dependent thereon are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration for allowance of the application in light of the foregoing is respectfully requested. Such early action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Registration No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com